



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

scripts, it may be expected that there will be an increasing demand for facsimiles of the more important codices at a reasonable price. The study of facsimiles and of careful collations will prepare the way for intelligent appreciation of that history of the Septuagint text which must some day be written.

J. M. P. S.

WICKS, HENRY J. *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature.* London: Hunter & Longhurst, 1915. xii+371 pages. 10s.

BURKITT, F. CRAWFORD. *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses.* [The Schweich Lectures, 1913.] London: Humphrey Milford, 1914. vii+80 pages. 3s.

Dr. Wicks has treated his subject in three chapters headed "The Transcendence of God," "The Justice of God," and "The Grace of God," which are subdivided in three periods of a century each. In the nine resulting sections every relevant passage in the literature is studied carefully and an attempt made to determine its exact meaning; at the end of each section the results are summarized and at the end of each chapter they are resummarized. The result is an extremely convenient compendium for quick orientation and rapid reference that must represent an amazing amount of labor on the author's part.

Further than this the book makes no claim to go, and its title is slightly misleading, for what it offers is rather a systematized collection of data for determining the doctrine of God than a presentation of the doctrine itself. Little is done to trace the relation and development of the ideas within the period treated, and outside of that period the author does not even glance. A second volume giving a historical treatment that would also take into consideration the origin of the concepts is greatly to be desired. And unfortunately the present volume was prepared before Canon Charles's standard edition of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha was available, and the work was done entirely with the aid of the older English translations, the German versions being disregarded entirely. In fact, very little attention has been paid to the work of Continental scholars, except where their results were available through translations, and the limits thus imposed are obvious.

Dr. Burkitt has presented his own conception of the apocalyptic literature in a very readable little volume full of suggestive hints (such as the parallel drawn on p. 30 between "Enoch" and Posidonius). The only important independent positions taken are a vigorous defense of the Gizeh MS of Enoch (in Appendix I) and a protest against literary-critical dissection of the Ascension of Isaiah (pp. 45 ff.). Apocalypses are "inherently inconsistent," "a logical Apocalypse would most likely be a dull Apocalypse" (p. 49).

B. S. E.

#### NEW TESTAMENT

PATTON, CARL S. *Sources of the Synoptic Gospels.* New York: Macmillan, 1915. xiii+263 pages. \$1.30.

Part I (pp. 3-120) of this work aims to give a survey of generally accepted synoptic results; it is clearly and attractively written and will serve admirably as an introduction to the Synoptic Problem. In Part II the author offers his own contribution to the subject, an argument that Q was used by Matthew and Luke in two different recensions that are to explain not only the different forms of the Q sayings in these

evangelists but also a considerable part of the special tradition of each. It is to be hoped that this theory will be developed elsewhere in greater detail, for at present the discussions of the various passages are too brief to carry conviction. Real contribution to so technical a subject as the Synoptic Problem can be made only by minute analysis and the weighing of alternative possibilities; Mr. Patton leaves the reader (doubtless wrongly) with the feeling that he is stating little more than general impressions. A wider familiarity with the literature of the subject would also strengthen the book; "J. H. Holtzmann" (*sic*) is quoted only once and Loisy is not noticed at all. And Berhard Weiss is likewise virtually ignored; an acquaintance with *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums* would have saved Mr. Patton from saying that the Hebraic character of Luke's infancy sections is "quite absent from his other peculiar material" (p. 211).

B. S. E.

LUMMIS, E. W. *How Luke Was Written*. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. viii+141 pages. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

Luke first wrote his Gospel with two sources and only two before him, a copy of Mark shorter than the present form and a somewhat illegible copy of Matthew. He set himself to copy as much of the contents of the two rolls as he thought important, at times making one primary and at times the other, but using elements from both in the sections contained in both. At first, principles of order obliged him to omit certain Matthean sayings, but he returned afterward and gave most of the omitted material in various "sequences," of which five are counted. The result, which contained nothing original, is styled Lk<sup>m</sup>. This work reacted on the text of Matthew. Many years later Luke returned to Lk<sup>m</sup> and revised and expanded it so as to produce the present Gospel, although the details of this last process are to be explained in a larger work.

This solution of the Synoptic Problem is offered in place of the two-document theory, chiefly as giving a more rigorous explanation of the variations in the order of the discourse sections in Luke and Matthew. Certainly many very interesting matters of detail have been brought out and no specialist in synoptic work will be able to ignore this very stimulating little book. But it does not carry conviction. The variations in order are treated as if they were elements in a mechanical problem, whereas the evangelists like all editors must often simply have followed their own taste and convenience in their arrangements; it is illegitimate to insist that a critic either must explain precisely why Matthew united two passages or else must abandon his theory. Mr. Lummis' arguments that Luke detected flaws in the logical sequence of Matthean passages often modernize the psychology of the evangelist, as much so as when he states that Luke thought Matthew's massacre of the children inherently improbable or his connection of baptism with righteousness too materialistic. And he leaves entirely too much unexplained. Why does not Luke agree at least occasionally with Matthew in the relative positions of discourse and Markan material? Why does this material appear so often in a more Jewish form in Luke than in Matthew? Why does Luke 11:17-23 omit from Matt. 12:25-30 precisely the words in which Matthew agrees with Mark? And, by no means least, how is the composition of Matthew to be accounted for? The two-document theory does not in itself explain all the phenomena, but its persistence in synoptic work is due to its necessity and not, as Mr. Lummis holds, to the fact that back in 1838 Weisse gave a "hasty answer" to a badly phrased question.

B. S. E.